



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/764,180	01/23/2004	Daniel ManHung Wong	50277-2405	7861
29989	7590	08/24/2006		EXAMINER
HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER, LLP 2055 GATEWAY PLACE SUITE 550 SAN JOSE, CA 95110			NGUYEN, CAM LINH T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2161	

DATE MAILED: 08/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/764,180	WONG, DANIEL MANHUNG	

  

<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
CamLinh Nguyen	2161	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 January 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 23 January 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>6/17/04</u> .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This Office Action is response to communication filed on 1/23/2004.
2. Claims 1 – 18 are currently pending.

#### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

3. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 6/17/2004 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98, and MPEP §600. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement has been placed in the application file and is being considered by the examiner.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 1 – 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claims appear to have no claimed result under the condition where the particular combination is not combination to which access is limited.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1 – 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujiwara et al (U.S. 2003/0014394 A1) in view of Pederson et al (U.S. 5,864,842).

♦ As per claims 1, 10

Fujiwara discloses a machine-implemented method, a machine-readable medium (Fig. 7 of Fujiwara) for managing access to data, the method comprising the steps of:

- “Detecting that a database command requires access to a particular combination of information” corresponds to the command send from a user using a third computer system (page 3, paragraph 0042, page 6 paragraph 0068 of Fujiwara).
- “And in response to the step of detecting, if the particular combination is a combination to which access is limited, rewriting said database command by creating a modified database command, based on the database command” Fujiwara teaches that a policy control is applied to the query (paragraph 0023 of Fujiwara) depending on user privileges (paragraph 0045 – 0046 of Fujiwara). Therefore, if the command or query that is a combination to which access is limited, the query is rewritten by creating a modified database command, based on the database command (page 6, paragraph 0068 – 0075 of Fujiwara).

Fujiwara does not clearly disclose that the database command requires access to a particular combination of information that is located in at least two tables. Fujiwara only teaches that the query can be a SELECT statement, specifying one or more column (paragraph 0068 of Fujiwara). However, Pederson, on the other hand, discloses a method for optimizing a query in join operation comprising the teaching of joining two tables (col. 1, lines 36 – 40, 54 – 64 of

Pederson). The Pederson also supports for database access control (col. 3, lines 35 – 41 of Pederson).

Since Fujiwara suggests that modification can be made to the invention such as to operate within a plurality of data processing environments (paragraph 0079 of Fujiwara), it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of Pederson into the invention of Fujiwara because the combination would provide the user more control in joining different tables and provides the user more information from the database (col. 1, lines 36 – 41 of Pederson).

♦ As per claims 2, 11, the combination of Fujiwara and Peterson disclose:

- “Wherein the step of detecting causes an invocation of a policy that causes a generation of a condition expression” corresponds to the package mask that including condition expression (See page 4 – 5, table I, of Fujiwara).
- “And wherein rewriting causes the modified database command to include the condition expression” See page 6, paragraph 0070 of Fujiwara.

♦ As per claims 3, 12, the combination of Fujiwara and Peterson disclose:

- “Wherein the generation of the condition expression is performed by referencing a policy function that returns the condition expression” See table I, paragraph 0070 of Fujiwara wherein Fujiwara teaches that the package mask (including the condition expression) is included in the query.

♦ As per claims 4, 13, the combination of Fujiwara and Peterson disclose:

- “Wherein the policy is not triggered by detecting that a database command requires access to a subset of tables of the at least two tables, wherein the subset of tables includes

at least one table” corresponds to the query that specified one or more columns in a certain table (See paragraph 0068 of Fujiwara).

♦ As per claims 5, 14, the combination of Fujiwara and Peterson disclose:

- “Wherein the detecting detects metadata includes one or more parameters that indicate which tables and which columns of the tables form the particular combination of information” “metadata includes one or more parameters” corresponds to the attributes, fields, etc. that specified in the query (See paragraph 0068 of Fujiwara).

♦ As per claims 6, 15, the combination of Fujiwara and Peterson disclose:

- “Wherein the particular combination of information is a particular combination of columns” See paragraph 0068 of Fujiwara.

♦ As per claims 7, 16, the combination of Fujiwara and Peterson disclose:

- “Wherein the detecting includes detecting that metadata defines the particular combination of columns as a combination of columns to which access is controlled” as indicated above, Fujiwara teaches that the user issues a query that is a combination of columns (paragraph 0068 of Fujiwara) and the access is controlled by including the mask function to mask out some data that the user does not have access permit (paragraph 0075 of Fujiwara).

♦ As per claims 8, 17, the combination of Fujiwara and Peterson disclose:

- “Further comprising the step of registering a policy function with a policy, wherein the policy function returns a condition expression, and the modified database command is based on the condition expression and the database command” since the mask functions

in the package mask are stored in the web/report server (Fig. 6 - 7 of Fujiwara), the policy must be registered in order to carry out the invention.

♦ As per claims 9, 18, the combination of Fujiwara and Peterson disclose:

- “Wherein the policy includes metadata identifying columns that are included in the particular combination of information” See Fig. 10 – 13 of Fujiwara wherein the policy includes metadata identifying columns (such as PT\_ID) that are included in the particular combination of information (different tables).

*Conclusion*

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Lei et al (U.S. 6,487,552 B1) disclose a database fine-grain access control.
- Robert Fabbio (U.s. 5,335,346) discloses an access control policies for an object oriented database including access control lists which span across object boundaries.
- Andrew Witkowski (U.S. 6,449,609 B1) discloses a method using materialized view to process a related query containing a one to many lossless join.
- Leung et al (U.S. 6,996,557 B1) discloses a method of optimizing SQL queries where a predicate matches nullable operands.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CamLinh Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272 - 4024. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

Art Unit: 2161

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey Gaffin can be reached on (571) 272 - 4146. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571 - 273 - 8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Nguyen, Cam-Linh

Art Unit 2161



LN